

REMARKS

Claims 3, 4, 11-17 are allowed.

Claim 16 stands objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 11. Claim 16 is hereby cancelled.

Claims 1, 2, 6-8 and 18 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirota et al (US 5873921 in view of Chamberlin (US 1148215)

Claims 5, 9, 10 and 19 stand object to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, and 11 are hereby amended to include the feature that the glass perform has an optical quality surface. Support for this amendment is found at page 4, lines 24-25 of the specification. Claim 1 is also amended to clearly point out that the rolling of the preform is caused by relative motion between the platens. This feature is already included in the other independent claims. New claims 20-23 claiming glass performs made by the methods of claims 1-4, respectively are hereby added. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims as amended is requested for the following reasons.

Applicant's invention is directed to methods and apparatus for making a cylindrical glass preform having convex optical quality end surfaces. A glass ball preform having an optical quality surface is placed between platens and rolled and compressed to form the cylindrical glass preform.

Hirota et al. disclose a method of making a glass optical element by pressing a softened glass material in a mold. Chamberlin discloses a method of making a blown glass article by attaching a glass blank to a blow pipe and pressing and rolling the glass blank between opposite surfaces (marvering) to produce a cylindrical shape. The Examiner argues that it would have been obvious to use the marvering means of Chamberlin to shape the preform of Hirota et al. to result in Applicants' invention. Applicants disagree.

As admitted by the Examiner, Hirota et al. do not suggest pressing and rolling a glass ball having an optical quality surface between platens to produce a cylindrical preform having convex optical quality end surfaces. Chamberlin teaches attaching a glass blank to a blow pipe and marvering the glass to produce a cylindrical glass article in which at least the end attached to the blow

pipe does not have a convex optical quality surface as disclosed and claimed by Applicants. The Examiner suggests modifying the marvering process of Chamberlin to shape the preform of Hirota et al. by dropping the preform of Hirota et al. onto a platen and rolling and compressing the preform to produce the present invention. However, in the traditional marvering process as taught by Chamberlin, the surfaces are pressed together while the glass blank is rotated by turning the blow pipe (see Page 1, lines 94-100). Neither Chamberlin nor Hirota et al. teach, show or suggest rolling a glass blank by imparting relative motion between surfaces as disclosed and claimed by Applicants. It is believed therefore that the combination suggested by the Examiner would not result in Applicants' invention as claimed in claims 1, 2, 3, 4 and 11.

It is also well settled that the motivation for combining or modifying a reference must come from the prior art, not Applicants' teaching. There is no motivation in either Hirota et al. or Chamberlin for dropping a preform on a platen and rolling and compressing the preform.

For the reasons noted above, it is believed that independent claims 1, 2, 3, 4 and 11 are allowable over the prior art. The remainder of the claims depend from or claim products by processes of one of these allowable claims and are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons.

It is believed that the claims in the application are allowable over the prior art and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas H. Close
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 27,428

THC:gms
Eastman Kodak Company
Rochester, New York 14650
Telephone: (585) 722-2396
Facsimile: (585) 477-4646